

HUMAN EVENTS

Vol. XVI, No. 2

Wednesday, January 14, 1959

Washington, D. C.

News Section

Printed in Two Sections

CONGRESS: *The "moderns" lose ground.....*(page 1)

MIKOYAN: *Chief of Red espionage.....*(page 4)

State Department gives its all (page 2)

CUBA: *How the US promoted Castro*(page 2)

LABOR: *More debts are paid.....*(page 3)

Capitol Hill in Conflict: "In the parliament of the present, every man represents a constituency of the past." This observation by James Russell Lowell a century ago is recalled under the Capitol Dome these days, as the embers of last week's fights in both parties still glow angrily.

The constituency of the past which the GOP "liberals" represent stems back to the days when special interests—then typified by "Wall Street"—actively intervened in running the affairs of the Senate. The garb of the interests has changed, from classical economics then to "liberal" collectivism today, but the key name hasn't changed at all. It's Rockefeller—this time, Nelson Rockefeller, Governor of New York, who is engaged in building himself up for the Presidential nomination in 1960. Flanked by friends of Thomas E. Dewey and the left-wing Anna Rosenberg, director of public relations of the Rockefeller family, the "constituency" has tried to force its will on the GOP in the Senate.

● HUMAN EVENTS exclusively reported, December 29, 1958, that a \$30,000 propaganda fund was provided at a meeting of Park Avenue "liberals." Hence the press and radio build-up for the pro-labor "liberal" Senator George Aiken (soon supplanted by Senator Cooper of Kentucky, of the same ilk); and hence the much-publicized drive to "stop Dirksen," candidate of the conservative majority.

On the eve of the balloting last week, the word went 'round: "The Dewey-Rockefeller heat is on; a lot of telephone calls from New York have been made to Senators." Some hitherto regarded as "sure for Dirksen" began to wobble. Meanwhile, the conservatives stiffened and right-wing Senator Karl Mundt (S.D.) threw in his hat for the "whip" position. When the votes were finally cast, Dirksen won the position of leadership by 20 to 14. Senator Kuchel (Calif.) won by 20 to 14 over Mundt. The latter, it is agreed, was handicapped because he had only two days of "electioneering"; his opponent had four weeks. All in all, the "moderns" from New York were decisively repulsed.

(Are there 14 GOP "liberals" in the Senate? Dopesters say no, probably only ten. It is estimated that four Senators voted against Dirksen not for ideological but for personal reasons. The eloquent Illinoisan has made a few enemies.)

● The Republican internal conflict flared even brighter in the House of Representatives, with Leader Joseph E. Martin (Mass.) a casualty—the first time an incumbent party leader has ever been ousted by votes in a party caucus. His opponent, Representative Charles A. Halleck (Ind.) won by a razor-thin margin.

However, "liberal vs. conservative" and ideological reasons had no part in this struggle. Halleck was proposed by the ultra-conservative Noah Mason of Illinois; and a leader in the drive that put Halleck over was a hard-driving young conservative from Wisconsin, Representative John Byrnes (who was elected to Martin's post as Chairman of the House GOP Policy Committee). In the voting tabulations printed in HUMAN EVENTS for October 20, 1958, Halleck shows a slightly more conservative pattern than Martin.

Martin had been under fire for some years for too much subservience to the White House. (Some who backed him raised the question as to whether Halleck might not prove just as obeisant, if not more so, to Executive wishes.) In any case, the outcome left bitterness not only with Martin himself, but many others. Martin dropped the remark, in thanking those who voted for him, that he was ready to "help" them in the session. Martin's long and close relationship with Democratic Speaker Rayburn is recalled. The seeds of continuing conflict within the House GOP cannot be ignored.

● Meanwhile, on the "other side of the aisle," the Democrats widened the already extensive breach in their own party ranks. Senate Leader Lyndon Johnson grabbed hold of a "compromise" solution of the inflammatory question of the filibuster and the rules change in the Senate, and rode roughshod over some of his party who sought a "radical" course. His parliamentary tactics were branded as "high-handed" by many members of his party, and Senator Paul Douglas (D.-Ill.) shouted, "This is really rough."

● In the House, a prominent Southern Democrat, Oren Harris of Arkansas, introduced the first of an expected series of bills aimed at curbing the power of the Supreme Court and crippling the Court's school integration decision. The Arkansan proposed a constitutional amendment that would allow the maintenance of segregated public institutions. He also introduced a bill aimed at keeping courts from voiding state laws on grounds that Federal legislation pre-empts the field. A similar Court bill (HR 3) passed the House last summer but died in the Senate by the narrow margin of one vote.

As the opening scene developed in the first few days, the going—to quote that usually pedantic professor, Senator Douglas—promises to be "really rough."

Strategy Chart: This is the situation as to Republican strategy on Capitol Hill, as the session begins: It all depends on Ike and/or the White House. The two new GOP congressional leaders—Dirksen and Halleck—are good bird dogs, but they look for direction from 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue. If Ike sticks to his recent “anti-radical” and “sound dollar” line, then the leaders on the Hill will follow this course with a way and a will. If Ike, however, wobbles and turns “liberal,” so also will the congressional leaders of the party; and then the party’s congressional ranks will split badly.

At present, conservative GOP leaders say that Ike is adhering faithfully to his “new look.” They therefore regard a battle over fiscal solvency with some optimism, particularly if certain plans (now still in the discussion stage) for a national public-relations crusade in behalf of an “honest dollar” mature.

● The “liberal” Democratic policy of pretending not to be radical but carrying out the wishes of their “labor boss” masters is obvious. But what stirs the most animated talk in corners of the cloakrooms is the Democratic maneuvering to produce a likely Presidential candidate in 1960. On that topic, the question mark is “Lyndon Johnson.”

The underlying strategy of the Southerners and of many Democrats in the North is as follows: for the short run, back Lyndon Johnson (with the assumption that actually no Southerner, including Johnson, can win the nomination). But the party can be solidified and a Southern bolt prevented—say party seers—by encouraging the Lyndon Johnson for nominee idea. Then, at the convention, the Southerners would switch from Johnson to allegedly “moderate” Senator John F. Kennedy (Mass.), thereby defeating such wild radicals as “Soapy” Williams and Hubert Humphrey, not to mention Adlai.

The architect of this strategy, it is said, is former Supreme Court Justice James Byrnes of South Carolina. Byrnes reportedly discussed it with Elder Statesman Barney Baruch last summer and found the latter favorable. Lyndon Johnson, in one of his many countenances, has reportedly assented to this deal.

However, even the seers admit two highly questionable factors: (1) Walter Reuther, who has the same objection to Kennedy as does Mrs. Roosevelt; and (2) Lyndon Johnson, whose ambitious makeup cannot be discounted. It would be surprising if the great maker of deals should eventually prove so modest as to forego the chance to make the biggest deal of all in favor of himself, rather than Kennedy.

Inside the White House: While there may be a “new Ike” in the White House, conservatives note, there are still some old influences operating there, too. Cited as a case in point is the recent promotion of William L. Mitchell, an old-line New Deal bureaucrat, to the post of Commissioner of Social Security.

When this appointment was first rumored, GOP National Chairman Meade Alcorn rushed to the White House, and urged that the post go to some regular Republican. The Chairman reportedly got assurances from Ike that a Republican would be named; but, scant weeks later, the Mitchell appointment went through.

Hill Republicans, who have seen their party morale crushed beneath the weight of such incredible favors to Democrats, comment that vestiges of Sherman Adams’ influence linger on.

Rout of the ‘Moderns’: Behind the rout of John Sherman Cooper (Ky.), “modern” candidate for the GOP leadership in the Senate, was the simple fact that he did not represent the outlook of the Republican party, whereas Minority Leader Everett Dirksen (Ill.) more closely approximated the traditionalist views of most of his colleagues. This fact is sharply highlighted in a recent study by *Congressional Quarterly*:

Gauging the “party unity” scores of the two men on roll call votes, CQ concluded that during the last (85th) Congress, Cooper’s views had represented those of his party only 47 per cent of the time. Dirksen’s “party unity” score, however, registered at 86 per cent.

Mikoyan: HUMAN EVENTS staffers were on hand to cover the proceedings when Soviet official Anastas Mikoyan dined, last Monday evening, with left-wing movie impresario Eric Johnston. Protesting the dinner “in honor” of the Kremlin dictator was a group of approximately 75 to 100 anti-Communist pickets, including expatriates from countries behind the Iron Curtain and indignant Americans.

One curious incident revolved around some extraordinary efforts to protect Mikoyan from any possible harm at the hands of demonstrators. As the Red boss’ limousine pulled up to the site of the dinner, a black Chevrolet sedan careened wildly through the streets, swerved in front of Mikoyan’s car, and plowed dramatically to a stop against the curb. The driver leaped from the car and scurried back to escort the Soviet hatchetman—and top Red spy—in to his dinner engagement. One bystander remarked to a HUMAN EVENTS reporter that this performance was so enthusiastic that the driver must have been from the Soviet Embassy. Questioning of authorities on the scene, however, revealed that the case was otherwise: the theatrical driver—risking life and limb, as well as public safety and taxpayers’ property, in order to protect Mikoyan—was an employee of the American State Department.

● The Mikoyan visit also served to illuminate a deepening conflict within the AFL-CIO. A luncheon featuring Mikoyan as star attraction was attended by a number of left-wing labor officials, including Walter Reuther and James Carey. Conspicuously absent from the gathering was AFL-CIO President George Meany, who is known in the Capital as an authentic anti-Communist and stern opponent of appeasement. Contacted by HUMAN EVENTS, Meany’s office gave this terse, revealing statement: “*Mr. Meany says he will not meet Mr. Mikoyan at any time or any place.*”

Cuba—A Little China: Fidel Castro is in power today because the United States Government put him there—that’s the conclusion that arises from an inspection of the last year’s struggle for control of Cuba. Castro—a fellow traveller of the Kremlin—now stands astride this vital outpost only 90 miles off the coast of Florida, not because “popular sentiment” carried him to victory, but

because certain elements in our State Department staged a small-scale repetition of the sellout of China.

For more than ten months before the final flight of Batista, the United States clamped an effective embargo on all arms aid to his regime, while the Castro forces were being supplied by gunrunners operating out of Florida and Texas. (A similar embargo, it is recalled, was imposed on the Chinese Nationalist forces at a crucial stage of their struggle against communism.)

Speculation as to the source of Castro's armament touches on reports, from March to December, 1958, of unidentified submarines that were spotted in Caribbean waters. Commentator Fulton Lewis, Jr., last week relayed a report that "Russian subs have been operating off the south coast of Cuba and were seen to have unloaded large quantities of military equipment, guns and ammunition." Some estimates as to the amount of help thus funneled to Castro run as high as 5000 tons of armament in recent months.

Meanwhile, because Batista's forces were completely equipped with American arms, and because no similar gun-running operation was under way for their benefit, they were starved for ammunition and replacements suitable for US weapons.

The result of this policy was that 2000 rifles intended for Batista were stranded on New York docks, a ship carrying ammunition from Sweden never got out of its home port, and negotiations for bazookas and other weapons were cut off in mid-flight. As the end drew near for the anti-Communist Batista, garrisons surrendered that had virtually exhausted their ammunition.

● A footnote to Castro's pro-communism was a recent dispatch, datelined Havana, in the newspaper *Diario Las Americas* (December 31): "A new radio station, identifying itself as 'the voice of the Communist party,' called on all workers and members of the Partida Popular Socialista, the name which has been taken by the Communist party in Cuba, to support the final struggles against the dictator."

"The announcer, after acclaiming the Soviet Union, called Raul Castro [Fidel Castro's brother and second in command] 'Comrade Communist' and referred to the Argentine 'Che' Guevara [another leader of the rebel forces] as an 'outstanding Communist and leader of the people.'"

Also significant was the remark of Castro's provisional president, Manuel Urrutia, who told newsmen that his government was going to make a "study" of communism: "I cannot say now whether it will be favorable [to communism] or not."

By way of contrast, the Batista regime (admittedly a typical corrupt Latin American government) demonstrated itself to be unswervingly anti-Communist: when Batista returned to power in Cuba in 1952, one of his first official acts was to break diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union; in 1956, it was the Batista regime which sponsored the UN resolution condemning the Soviet Union for its atrocities in Hungary.

Labor Front: In its issue of December 22, 1958, HUMAN EVENTS reported the case of Samuel Rizzo, a United Auto Workers official appointed as administra-

tive assistant to Congressman Gerald Flynn (D.-Wis.). The Chicago *Tribune* last week noted further that, "just to demonstrate his complete submission to the forces of the AFL-CIO Committee on Political Education, which contributed largely to his narrow victory in November, Flynn has announced that he is installing another union man as secretary in his home office in Racine." Also reported is the case of Congressman Walter H. Moeller (D.-O.), who will employ union personnel on his staff.

Staff people on the Hill relay to HUMAN EVENTS two instances in which yet another leftist lobbying group, the Farmers Union, has placed its personnel in the offices of favored legislators. One of these is Senator William Proxmire (D.-Wis.), who named Robert G. Lewis as his administrative assistant. Lewis resigned a post with the Washington office of the Farmers Union to take the Proxmire job. (In the first three quarters of 1958, the Farmers Union spent \$67,959 for lobbying purposes.)

Similarly, far-left Congressman George McGovern (D.-S.D.)—whose electoral practices were surveyed in the December 22, 1958, issue of HUMAN EVENTS—appointed ex-Farmers Union employee Robert Nelson to his Capital staff. Nelson left his job as public relations director for the South Dakota Farmers Union to make the trip to Washington.

Schools: Statistics from the US Office of Education disprove that agency's own complaints that American schools stand in dire need of Federal money: a recent Office of Education bulletin, "Statistical Summary of State School Systems, 1955-'56," reveals that, while enrollment increased 8.1 per cent between 1953-'54 and 1955-'56, outlays for public schools went up 20.5 per cent.

HUMAN EVENTS is preparing an important report on featherbedding practices. We would appreciate receiving case histories from readers. Give us full documentation, copies of union contracts and printed material describing the practices.

PASTORS APPLAUD HUMAN EVENTS

REV. I. L. LLEWELLYN, Methodist Church, Shenandoah, Virginia: "HUMAN EVENTS is one of the most valuable periodicals coming to my desk."

DONALD E. OSBORNE, Pastor, Church of Christ, Stony Creek, Connecticut: "HUMAN EVENTS is a new Washington Monument."

REV. CARL I. FANT, Bethel Lutheran Church, Danville, Illinois: "I have enjoyed and appreciated HUMAN EVENTS a great deal for its information and details not otherwise available. It's a real service."

NORRIS W. FULFER, Pastor, First Baptist Church, Fortuna, California: "HUMAN EVENTS helps me to keep abreast of the political trends, and to think more clearly about events as they arise."

REV. KIRBY EDWARDS, First Methodist Church, Blanco, Texas: "HUMAN EVENTS is one of the finest pieces of material that comes to my office. I keep all copies for future use."

REV. S. McMASTER KERR, First Presbyterian Church, Kalispell, Montana: "I have found HUMAN EVENTS the most refreshing and informative of all the publications I receive and would not want to be without it."

JOHN HEIDT, Pastor, Pleasant Street Congregational Church, Arlington, Massachusetts: "HUMAN EVENTS is the piece of literature I most eagerly await each week."

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTIONS to HUMAN EVENTS for new subscribers only: 5 weeks \$1.

Yearly rate, \$11; 6 months, \$6; 3 months, \$3.

By first class mail, \$13 a year; by airmail (including APO and FPO) \$15 a year. FOREIGN: \$14 a year; airmail, Europe, Latin America, \$21 a year; airmail, Asia, Africa and Pacific, \$36 a year.

Bound Annual Volume with complete index, \$15. Only 1955, 1956, and 1957 volumes available.

For change of address send old address (exactly as it appears on the envelope of your copy of HUMAN EVENTS) and new address (with zone number if any). Allow us 2 weeks to process new subscriptions and changes of address.

The Declaration of Independence opens: "When in the course of HUMAN EVENTS . . ."

HUMAN EVENTS, 408 First St., SE, Washington 3, D. C., is a weekly Washington news-letter. Founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. Published usually in two sections: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article section. Second-class postage paid at Washington, D. C. Copyright 1959.

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, Editor and Publisher
M. STANTON EVANS, Managing Editor

JAMES L. WICK, Executive Publisher
FRANK CHODOROV, Contributing Editor

JANUARY 14, 1959

NEWS 3

Mikoyan: Moscow's Master of Subversion

By ELIZABETH CHURCHILL BROWN

IT IS THE consensus of opinion among informed sources in Washington that Anastas Mikoyan, Deputy Premier of the Soviet Union, is visiting the United States for two principal reasons. One is to obtain trade agreements with the US which would give the Soviets somewhere between \$2 billion and \$3 billion in long-term credits, and the other is to lay the groundwork for a Summit conference between President Eisenhower and Premier Khrushchev. Mikoyan is well-equipped for his assignment; he is a veteran at wangling giveaways from America.

American officials first became familiar with Mikoyan at the beginning of World War II, when he was in charge of receiving Lend Lease from America. General John R. Deane, chief of our military mission in Moscow, gave a very graphic picture of Mikoyan's abilities in his book, *Strange Alliance*:

... He gave elaborate luncheons for all foreign representatives who visited Moscow, especially those who had even a remote connection with providing supplies to Russia. These visitors would usually pay some tribute to Mikoyan's shrewdness when responding to his toasts. This always delighted Mikoyan's vanity, but the foreigner was usually dismayed during negotiations to find the playful jest of his toast was in fact stark reality. Unless one was constantly on guard, Mikoyan would take his shirt.

AS IMPORTANT as it is to know something of Mikoyan's past as a horse trader, his other activities concerning America over the past 20 years have probably had far more effect on our national defense (or lack of it) than the average Government official has any idea of. Along with being the Foreign Trade Commissar as well as the Soviet counterpart of Lend Lease Director Harry Hopkins, Mikoyan was chief of Soviet espionage into our war industries.

Mikoyan's headquarters in Washington for his spy network was the Soviet Purchasing Commission. A few years after the end of the war a former member of that group, Victor A. Kravchenko, told the House Committee on Un-American Activities:

... the Soviet Purchasing Commission during the war had more than a thousand employees. Some of them came to the United

States as simple engineers, but in reality they were in top positions in industry or in scientific research. Some came as civilians, but really they were officers of the Navy or artillery or tank troops or the air force. ... On the seventh floor of the Soviet Purchasing Commission, behind the iron door at 3355 Sixteenth Street ... there was a special department of the NKVD ...

Kravchenko related an event in late 1943, when orders came from Mikoyan to the Purchasing Commission, making it clear "that we had to find out all secret information about industrial development in the United States, and especially the military industry." "Military industry," of course, can cover a great deal of ground, and there is good reason to believe that Mikoyan considered the atomic bomb within his scope. In fact, his ability to extract not only the formulae but the materials for making the atomic bomb should have brought him Soviet Russia's highest honors.

This story of the diversion of information and materials begins in the early years of the War, with the birth of Lend Lease. At that time the only way in which our war materials could get to Russia was by ships, which had to find their way through a long and dangerous sea route to Russia's northern ports of Murmansk and Archangel. The high success of German naval attacks made the cost of supplying the Reds appalling; the average loss was one out of every three ships, although one convoy of 38 lost the staggering total of 36 ships.

A new funnel for Lend Lease was devised when American planes were flown to Alaska, where they were picked up by Russian pilots and flown to Russia. These planes carried tons of "diplomatic pouches." Major George Racey Jordan, in charge of these Lend Lease shipments, surreptitiously opened some of the huge cases which were traveling under diplomatic immunity. He discovered not only boxes and containers filled with strange materials, but hundreds of papers "which bristled with formulae, calculations and professional jargon."

Among these papers he discovered a letter written in longhand on White House stationery. It was addressed to A. I. Mikoyan and signed by Harry Hopkins. After the war Major Jordan discovered

that the materials were ingredients for the atomic bomb and that the formulae were the "blueprints" for its manufacture.

The question comes to mind today: Who succeeded the late Harry Hopkins as Mikoyan's friend in Washington after the former's death in 1945? It would be foolish to believe that, having had such fantastic successes, Mikoyan should have ceased his espionage activities into our innermost military secrets.

In 1953, Dr. Medford Evans, former Chief of Training of the Atomic Energy Commission, made this estimate of the effectiveness of the Soviet industrial espionage network: "It is possible that U-235 and plutonium, the 'nuclear components' of the atomic bomb, have been systematically diverted from Oak Ridge, Hanford, and Los Alamos in sufficient quantities to charge perhaps 20 atomic bombs."

IF MIKOYAN's present boss, Khrushchev, should by any chance still question his Trade Commissar's success, the latter need only to quote a statement of Lieutenant General Arthur Trudeau, our Chief of Army Research and Development. Last September 16 the General said: "the advanced state of Soviet technology today is due more to Soviet success in espionage than it is to their scientific apparatus, as good as it is."

To back up this "evidence," Mikoyan can also refer to the testimony of Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer, whose loyalty was being questioned before the Atomic Energy Commission's Personnel Security Board in 1954. Dr. Oppenheimer told the Board that the reason he did not want to help in the building of the hydrogen bomb and discouraged other scientists from the work was because if the United States built one, Russia would build one. If the United States did not build one, Russia would not build one.

The implications of this remark are startling, and constitute an effective testimonial to Mikoyan's espionage work. Oppenheimer obviously did not mean that the Soviets would refrain from building an H-bomb out of a sense of fairness to us. *What he must have meant was that Soviet agents could not steal what the United States had not invented, and that Russian scientists could not make what they did not steal from us.*

Perhaps no other Soviet official has so vast a knowledge of America's military potential, from bombs to butter, as Anastas Mikoyan. As a dinner partner he should be delightful. There would be so much to talk about!

Elizabeth Churchill Brown is the author of *The Enemy at His Back* (Bookmailer), and a frequent contributor to HUMAN EVENTS. Her most recent contribution was "The Secret of Political Success," August 25, 1958.

NEW YORK'S NEWSPAPER BLACKOUT

How A Gangster Union Throttled the Metropolis

By FRED J. COOK

IN DECEMBER, a racket-ridden newspaper deliverers union, twice defying its own leadership, closed every major newspaper in New York, and kept them closed for more than two weeks. A union of some 2,000 members—ex-convicts prominent in its ranks, shakedowns and loan-sharking its lucrative sidelines—has demonstrated its power to hamstring the entire newspaper industry and to black out the Nation's largest city from any comprehensive report of the news of the Nation and the world. This is the tragic truth behind the New York newspaper strike.

The strike was disowned by all the other large and more reputable unions in the newspaper business. It was a disaster for all involved: for the newspapers, many already walking a financial tightrope; for thousands of furloughed workers cast out of jobs in winter, at Christmastime; for a wide variety of businesses that could not get their messages to the public and lost millions of dollars in potential revenue; for the public itself, which found it impossible, without newspapers, to keep in intelligent contact with the daily events of the world, and, lastly, for decent unions which cannot fail to be hurt by the backfire of public reaction against a strike without perceivable issue or justifiable cause. For all of these groups, the newspaper deliverers strike, called after it had been—to all appearances—satisfactorily settled, was unmitigated disaster.

No strike of modern times burst more suddenly, more unexpectedly, upon the public of New York. On December 9, *The New York Times* reported happily: "A strike by delivery workers against nine New York newspapers was settled yesterday." Just 24 hours later, the *Times* and all other New York newspapers were off the street. And on Thursday, December 11, the papers, unable to get deliveries, suspended publication.

What were the causes of this citywide shut-

down? Some are still obscure, but this is the surface sequence:

Representatives of the Publishers Association of New York City and the unaffiliated Newspaper and Mail Deliverers Union had been engaged in protracted negotiations for a new contract. The strike had actually been called at 12:01 a.m. December 8, when pickets had been withdrawn after night-long negotiations brought apparent agreement.

THE BASIS OF the agreement was the same wage package negotiated with the New York Newspaper Guild in November. The truck drivers and delivery men, already getting a base wage of \$103.50 for a 40-hour week, would have received a \$7 weekly increase spread over two years, \$4 the first year and \$3 the second. The weight of paper bundles handled by the deliverers was to be cut from 53 to 50 pounds (instead of the 40 pounds the union had been asking). The new contract also provided for three days' leave for union members when there was a death in the immediate family. These were the gains. The union, on the other hand, abandoned its demands for a 35-hour week, twelve holidays instead of eight, four weeks' vacation instead of three, sick leave and a \$10 wage increase to include pension, welfare and fringe benefits. Obviously, the union had left many of its demands at the bargaining table, but this is almost routine in any negotiation. It had still made gains and Samuel Feldman, its president, evidently believing that the gains would be satisfactory to the membership, disbanded the pickets and called off the strike. But Feldman guessed wrong. In day-long balloting on December 9, the membership repudiated the recommended contract, and the strike was on.

Other unions, both the craft unions and the Newspaper Guild representing editorial and

commercial employees, crossed the deliverers' picket lines and reported for work. All of the nine New York newspapers printed on December 10, but they could not distribute. Faced with heavy financial losses, they suspended publication on December 11 and furloughed workers by the thousands.

The effects of the strike were immediate and almost incalculable. For the newspapers themselves, it represented the worst kind of financial disaster. The recession year had been a hard one. Not until fall had advertising revenues begun to pick up in line with business recovery, and most of the papers had looked forward to heavy Christmas advertising to bail out the year. The strike came just at the time to kill off this revenue. For some of the afternoon papers, the editions of December 10 and 11 had been scheduled to contain the heaviest advertising of the year; for the morning papers, the bonanza was in their Sunday editions of December 14. According to the Associated Press, the Sunday papers had scheduled \$3.8 million in advertising. The strike wiped it out.

These were only the immediate effects. The long-range repercussions may be even more disastrous. While it is not generally realized, the New York newspaper operation today is largely a marginal one financially. Of all the major dailies, only two, the Daily News and The New York Times, reap the kind of huge gross revenues that insure considerable profit. Despite strike insurance, about which publishers are always extremely reticent, there is a distinct possibility that some of the other papers may not be able to absorb the kind of losses entailed in the wiping out of all Christmas advertising and the complete shutdown of business; one ultimate effect of a prolonged strike might be that the drastically narrowed New York newspaper field will be curtailed still further by the folding or merger of some of the existing papers.

THIS IS THE grim newspaper picture. But more than the newspapers themselves have been hurt by this strike. The public and business generally have suffered.

The Associated Press estimated that the strike in its first week had cost at least \$13 million. Some 15,000 skilled newspaper workers had

been thrown out of jobs and lost \$1.5 million in wages. Many lines of business were adversely affected. The entertainment industry was especially hard-hit. One night club, billing the opening of a top-name star, reported it had only 25 per cent of the normal quota of customers. The legitimate theaters, except for the few with hit shows which were sold out well in advance, were frustrated by inability to call their offerings to the attention of the public. A spokesman for the motion-picture industry estimated that attendance was off 20 per cent.

Restaurants lost business. So did neighborhood shops and some department stores. A spokesman for the Newsdealers Association of Greater New York estimated that more than 90 per cent of the association's 2,000 members had closed down for the duration of the strike. Some department stores reported the normal Christmas rush, but one estimated that loss of mail and telephone orders had cut weekly receipts five to eight per cent. One large Brooklyn department store cut its Sunday telephone-order salesmen by 75 per cent, and while a spokesman wouldn't estimate how much orders had dropped, he said: "It's like comparing a whole lot with practically nothing."

For the general public, news became a rare commodity. Sketchy radio and television bulletins quickly proved no substitute for the detailed news accounts and analyses of the daily papers.

In such manner was the life of New York disrupted by a relatively small union, long known as the most irresponsible in the newspaper business. The independent Newspaper and Mail Deliverers Union is a vestigial remnant from the days when newspapers engaged in fierce circulation wars and it was considered almost routine to crack skulls to insure priority on the newsstands. Times have changed, but not the deliverers union.

While it would be unfair to tar its entire membership with the racket label, it is indisputable that the union harbors many ex-convicts, that its rank and file contains a disproportionate number of chiselers and toughs, and that the activities of this element lend a character to the whole. It is a closed and tightly-knit unit. Its membership originally was limited to sons and close male relatives of members, but outsiders have found a way in through the

payoff. Talk to circulation personnel on the papers or to members of the union itself, and you'll hear stories of as much as \$5,000 being paid for a union card; the more usual price is in the neighborhood of \$500.

Obviously, when a man pays \$500 or \$5,000 for his membership ticket, he expects to get his money back—and not just by earning \$103 a week as a truck driver. He is looking for a bigger take, and he doesn't much care whether he gets it by shakedown, by an out-and-out underworld racket, or both. This is the basis of the corruption that has given the union as a whole much of its unsavory character.

The union unquestionably harbors men who are loan sharks, policy-runners, bookies. Officials of other unions with intimate knowledge of the personnel and activities of the deliverers insist, too, that the union sometimes serves as a labor reservoir for big-time racketeers; that its members sometimes drive the trucks in hijacking jobs when the loot may be coffee, perfume or furs.

These are the major rackets, but the penny-ante chisel isn't overlooked. Some deliverers continually steal papers from blind and handicapped newsdealers; a rather common practice is the extortion of 50 cents or \$1 a week from each newsdealer on a route to guarantee that he gets his papers delivered at the same time as his neighboring competitor. If he doesn't pay, he suddenly finds that he has no papers to sell.

Discussing these practices, a spokesman for the Independent Blind Newsboys Association described the deliverers in these scathing terms: "These are dogs—dogs. They steal from blind men, from old widows, from cripples with no hands and no legs."

Such is the deliverers union—a union in which one local business agent was actually elected to his post while he was serving time in Sing Sing for embezzlement. Such is the union that closed up the newspapers of New York. The inevitable question arises: What could the publishers have done about it?

They were on an unenviable spot. Granted that they have been saddled with a tough union inherited from the brawling past, their only hope lay in placating it with a contract good enough to keep the men on the job. They ob-

viously had the right to think they had achieved such a contract in the negotiations of December 8, when Feldman and his negotiating committee agreed to terms and pulled pickets off the lines. The surprise revolt of the rank and file, the strike that became instantly a *fait accompli* without time for further discussion or negotiation, caught the publishers by surprise, cost them millions in revenues and hardened them, not unnaturally, into a stand of utter intransigence.

THE PUBLISHERS' first reaction was to pull back the contract they had already offered and to insist that they would give nothing. It was an untenable maneuver and one that was strategically ill-advised, because it could only arouse tempers and solidify the opposition. Federal mediators talked the publishers out of this stand, and Feldman and Asher Schwartz, union counsel, both of whom apparently sincerely wanted a settlement, agreed to resubmit the original and once-rejected proposal to a union membership meeting on December 16. Mediators, it is understood, tried to get the publishers to agree to some additional, relatively inconsequential, but face-saving concessions. The publishers refused. It was to be the original pact hammered out on December 8—or nothing.

The answer was, almost inevitably, nothing. Yet the manner in which nothingness was achieved was in itself a graphic illustration of the problem the publishers faced. Practically the entire union membership of more than 2,000 men turned out for the meeting to decide whether they should take a formal vote the next day on the contract. But it was evident almost from the start that decision rested not with the overwhelming mass of the rank and file, but with a hard and organized core that had come prepared to wrest power from the hands of Feldman and Schwartz.

They came early, in a phalanx. They preempted all the front seats in the meeting hall, forming a solid bloc of strength, prepared placards ready to wave on signal. Leaders of the group held whispered conferences, couriers scurried out with messages, circulated in the rear of the hall, came back for further instructions. When Feldman tried to speak on the proposal, so much noise was made that hardly anyone could hear him. When an expression of

sentiment was finally asked, it was overwhelming—about 80 per cent shouting and stamping their decision not to reconsider the contract.

The collapse of this second attempt to achieve settlement on the original terms canceled out all chance the papers had to resume publication in the week before Christmas and recoup some of their lost advertising. The attitude of the publishers stiffened as a result. Mayor Robert F. Wagner offered his services as a mediator; but his aides frankly confessed there was little he could do. Having failed to avert the strike, having lost millions in revenues, the publishers seemed determined not to give away even a single well-gnawed bone.

It is not hard to sympathize with them under the circumstances, even when one is, like myself, a strong union man who has walked a picket line. The plain facts—and the tragic facts to a union man—are that this was a strike it is impossible to support. Even union spokesmen explaining their needs on the radio did not sound very convincing.

They explained that the union wanted improvements in sick leave and holidays, and a shorter work week. One desire of the union obviously was to make a start in the direction of the Guild's 35-hour week; but since delivery times cannot be cut, this means the piling up of overtime and additional heavy expense to the papers—something that, in their present mood, the publishers have not been prepared to grant. In any event, nothing in the package seemed to warrant or to justify the kind of strangling strike that emerged.

Beyond this, expert reporters who have watched the progress of the strike and have covered the union meetings have come away with the definite feeling that the whole contract-strike issue may have been used as a power play in the inner warfare of a racket-spattered union. Obviously, there was some genuine dissatisfaction among the rank and file over the terms of the proffered contract; and obviously, this was a sentiment that could be whipped up and exploited to discredit the leadership of Feldman. The opportunity, it seems, presented itself for ruthless men to turn this undercurrent to their own purposes. If they could repudiate the contract Feldman had been prepared to sign, if they could bludgeon better terms from

the publishers, they would put themselves in an almost unassailable position with the rank and file. And control of this kind of union could mean all kinds of plums.

MANY SUSPECT this kind of motivation behind the scenes of the deliverymen's strike. The suspicion, though seemingly well-founded, cannot now be verified, partly because the leaders of the well-organized clique haven't publicly revealed themselves. Even after rejecting consideration of a contract for the second time, the real powers in the union let Feldman and the original negotiators remain out in front. This left leaders of the rump movement in a comfortable shadowland of obscurity, and all that can be told today is what has been observed of the activities of some of the individuals who have appeared most industrious in whipping up strike sentiment.

One of the most active agitators, a man who has circulated widely among various locals, is the possessor of a long criminal record. He was once convicted in connection with a nationally rigged policy game, run by the highest echelons of the underworld, with a take high in the millions. The unsavory emissary is reported to be boosting the political capital of another ex-convict, with a record as long and unprepossessing as his own, as Feldman's possible successor.

The character of these men and the extent of their activity suggests that the terms of a labor contract may have been a mere pawn in a richer and more rewarding game, looking to control of the union and the more remunerative of its rackets. And the corollary to that is that the newspapers of the Nation's greatest city—and the public—have been used as pawns, too.

Fred J. Cook is a crime reporter on one of New York City's metropolitan dailies. This article of his originally appeared in the well-known "liberal" weekly, *The Nation*.

ORDER BLANK	
HUMAN EVENTS, 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D. C.	
Send me _____ reprints of "NEW YORK'S NEWSPAPER BLACKOUT" at \$ _____	
☐ Payment enclosed	☐ Bill me
Additional copies of this 4-page article: single copy 20c (coins, not stamps); 10 copies \$1; 25 copies \$2; 100 copies \$5; 500 copies \$20; 1,000 copies \$30. In 5,000 lots \$25 per thousand. News section sold separately—at same rates. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery, add one cent a copy, for airmail, add two cents a copy.	
Enter my subscription ☐ 5 weeks for \$1 ☐ 1 year for \$11	
Name _____	
Street _____	
City _____ Zone _____ State _____	